

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

PRESERVING COMMUNITIES
THROUGH ECONOMIC UNITY,

Case No. 15-CV-3127 (JRT/TNL)

Plaintiff,

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

v.

CAMDEN PROPERTY TRUST,

Defendant.

Plaintiff Preserving Communities Through Economic Unity did not pay the required filing fee for this case, but instead filed an application seeking leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”). *See* ECF No. 2. In an order dated August 19, 2015, this Court noted that only natural persons qualify for IFP status and denied plaintiff’s IFP application. *See* ECF No. 4 at 1 (citing *Rowland v. California Men’s Colony, Unit II Men’s Advisory Council*, 506 U.S. 194, 196 (1993)). Plaintiff was given 20 days to pay the required \$400.00 filing fee, failing which it would be recommended that this action be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

That deadline has now passed, and plaintiff has not paid the required filing fee. In fact, plaintiff has not communicated with the Court about this case at all since commencing this action. Accordingly, this Court now recommends, in accordance with its prior order, that this action be dismissed without prejudice under Rule 41(b) for failure to prosecute. *See Henderson v. Renaissance Grand Hotel*, 267 Fed. App’x 496, 497 (8th Cir. 2008) (per curiam) (“A district court has discretion to dismiss an action under Rule 41(b) for a plaintiff’s failure to prosecute, or to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or any court order.”).

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing, and on all of the files, records, and proceedings herein, IT IS
HEREBY RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. This action be DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) for failure to prosecute.
2. Plaintiff's motion for a hearing [ECF No. 3] be DENIED AS MOOT.

Dated: September 17, 2015

s/ Tony N. Leung
Tony N. Leung
United States Magistrate Judge

NOTICE

Filing Objections: This Report and Recommendation is not an order or judgment of the District Court and is therefore not appealable directly to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Under Local Rule 72.2(b)(1), "a party may file and serve specific written objections to a magistrate judge's proposed finding and recommendations within 14 days after being served a copy" of the Report and Recommendation. A party may respond to those objections within 14 days after being served a copy of the objections. LR 72.2(b)(2). All objections and responses must comply with the word or line limits set for in LR 72.2(c).

Under Advisement Date: This Report and Recommendation will be considered under advisement 14 days from the date of its filing. If timely objections are filed, this Report and Recommendation will be considered under advisement from the earlier of: (1) 14 days after the objections are filed; or (2) from the date a timely response is filed.